DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 097 085 JC 740 408

AUTHOR Milne, Terry L.
TITLE Community College Student Personnel Services.
NOTE 26p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Bibliographies; College Role; College Students; *Community Colleges; *Human Development; *Literature Reviews; Post Secondary Education; *Student College Relationship; *Student Personnel Services

ABSTRACT

Literature related to community college student personnel services is cited and discussed. A table presents the 22 essential functions that student affairs operations must be able to perform, according to the authors of a 1965 Carnegie study of community college student personnel services. These functions are: (1) Orientation Functions (distribution of precollege information, student induction, group orientation, dissemination of career information); (2) Appraisal Functions (personnel records, educational testing, applicant appraisal, health appraisal); (3) Consultation Functions (student counseling, student advisement, applicant consulting); (4) Participation Functions (cocurricular activities, student self-government); (5) Regulation Functions (student registration, academic regulation, social regulations); (6) Service Functions (financial aids, placement); and (7) Organizational Functions (program articulation, inservice education, program evaluation, administrative organization). The decentralization of student personnel services, the establishment of human development courses, and the administration of student development programs are discussed. A lengthy bibliography is included. (DB)

COMMUNITY COLLEGE STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICES

Terry L. Milne
Director of Residence Living
Central Washington State College

Doctoral Candidate
Washington State University

Necessity has taught the junior college to serve many functions, the most central of which is that of student personnel. . . . the student personnel program should be the pivot, the hub, the core around which the whole enterprise moves. It provides the structure and creates the pervasive atmosphere which prompts the junior college to label itself as student centered.

--Charles C. Collins

Community college student personnel services[1] often have been patterned after those of secondary schools and four year colleges. As a result, critics have accused junior college administrators of adopting their programs from such systems while making few significant efforts to formulate new, more appropriate programs that would better meet the non-academic needs of community college students (George and George, 1971). These questionable origins, coupled with the low profile student affairs divisions have maintained in many community colleges, have created much discussion as to what place, if any, student personnel services should have in the evolving junior college community (O'Banion, 1971). This unresolved question has resulted in student personnel divisions on many campuses being frowned upon and considered highly suspect by the instructional divisions (Creamer, 1972). In some community colleges, the student personnel services have even become the butt of the old standing joke that the last people from whom students seek advice are the counselors and deans (Emmet, 1971).

The entire situation is regrettable considering that almost all community college catalogues list student development services and/or counseling and guidance as one of the half dozen major priorities of the two year college (O'Banion, 1971). Yet, even the student services practioners often must reluctantly admit that student personnel work often has been long on promises, but short on delivery. The rhetoric has been grand; but the programs seldom have

---

1. The terms "community college," "junior college," and "two year college" have been employed interchangeably in this paper. The terms "student personnel services," "student services," and "student affairs" also have been used synonomously.

achieved any grandier. Because they are functioning well below the level of their potential many existing student affairs departments could be phased out with no visible loss to the students or programs of the institutions in which they are located (Matson, 1972). Voicing his thoughts on this issue, Wiegman (1969) has stated that "Purely on the basis of economics, I doubt that we can really justify the expenditure of time and money for activities (i.e., student services) which attract only a minority of our student body [p. 22]." Thus, in the future the ineffectual condition of student services on many campuses may cause the deans of students and their programs to be the first casualties of the coming accountability revolution (O'Banion, 1972).

Realizing that community college student personnel services have become embroiled in a deepening credibility crisis, concerned professionals like Charles Collins, Terry O'Banion, and Jane Matson have begun to urge a vast reformation of the student personnel programs. O'Banion (1971) has rightly noted that the basic rationale supporting the existence of student personnel work in the community colleges is that the student personnel point of view[2] and the community college point of view are synonymous. Therefore, if student affairs programs are to serve any significant function in the community college scheme, they are going to have to develop into dynamic, moving forces whose

---

2. The student personnel point of view encompasses the student as a whole. The concept of education is broadened to include attention to the student's well rounded development--physically, socially, emotionally, and spiritually, as well as intellectually. The student is thought of as a responsible participant in his own development. His full and balanced maturity is viewed as a major end goal of education. The realization of this objective cannot be attained without interest in an integration of efforts toward the development of each and every facet of the student's personality and potential (American Council on Education, 1949).

influence will be felt in curriculum decisions, the instructional process, by the faculty conclaves, the community, and in the general decision making processes of the college (O'Banion, 1971). To accomplish this end, student personnel workers first need to struggle to free their activities from the laymen's mystique that these services encompass a group of magic rituals that can "metamorphosis each unselected junior college student into a self-fulfilled, goal-oriented, educational and vocational success [Collins, 1967]"--i.e., the results that might be expected from the programs must be accurately projected and placed in proper perspective.

The literature of the field has implied that student personnel programs have made a momentous shift from the roles of regulator-repressor, therapist, and maintenance-service to a new orientation toward student development (O'Banion, 1971). In doing so, community college student services programs theoretically have abandoned their reactive, rehabilitative stance in order to assume an active role in aiding students to better define their personal character, improve their intellect, shape their personalities, train for citizenship, and prepare for vocations (McDaniel). In reality, however, the junior college student services programs still have a long distance to travel before they will be functioning effectively from a student development perspective. The continued diversity of junior college student populations, high attrition rates, and gross discrepancies between student aspirations and achievement levels are just a few of the elements that hopefully will encourage the continued upgrading of student personnel programs (Collins, 1967). The need for effective student personnel units definitely exists. The real question centers upon whether these divisions will be able to respond adequately to this demand.

* * * *

Essentially, community college student personnel programs are an assemblage of services and activities relying on incentives and some restrictive controls in an effort to assist students in making full use of the institutions' educational programs (McDaniel). The variety or range of services differs somewhat from one college to another and from one year to the next. However, the number and type of services have not increased or decreased appreciably since 1964 (Matson, 1972).

Many ways exist in which to organize the student personnel functions of a college, but usually they can be easily subdivided into six administrative units: (a) admissions, registration, and records, (b) placement and financial aids, (c) student activities, (d) guidance and counseling, (e) special services, and (f) a central administrative unit (Raines, 1965). In addition, Table 1 records what the authors of the 1965 Carnegie study of community college student personnel services have defined as the 22 essential functions these student affairs operations must be able to perform. But before these functions can be properly implemented in a community college, the governing board, faculty, and student personnel administrators all must become committed to the overall goal of enhancing student development (Collins, 1967). Likewise, the emphasis of the student services program must be placed upon the encouragement of positive changes in student behavior rather than on a preoccupation with the efficient functioning of each division (O'Banion, 1971). In essence, student affairs programs must work toward becoming that division of the community college which facilitates and enhances the entire student learning experience (O'Banion, 1971).

TABLE 1

Essential Student Personnel Functions to Be Provided by a Community College

ORIENTATION FUNCTIONS	
Distribution of precollege information	Group orientation
Student induction	Dissemination of career information
APPRAISAL FUNCTIONS	
Personnel records	Applicant appraisal
Educational testing	Health appraisal
CONSULTATION FUNCTIONS	
Student counseling	Applicant consulting
Student advisement	
PARTICIPATION FUNCTIONS	
Cocurricular activities	Student self-government
REGULATION FUNCTIONS	
Student registration	Social regulations
Academic regulation	
SERVICE FUNCTIONS	
Financial aids	Placement
ORGANIZATIONAL FUNCTIONS	
Program articulation	Program evaluation
In-service education	Administrative organization

If student services are going to operate effectively from this developmental perspective, they must become a co-curriculum that will share equal status with the formalized academic curriculum. Rather than being complementary, supplementary or merely supportative of the instructional program, the student personnel division needs to consider assuming a central teaching function in the community college (Crookston, 1972; Blocker, 1972).

The suggested modifications of student personnel operations from the skeleton of what writers in the field have come to call the student development model or student development point of view. Student development theorists advocate that this model approach allows students the freedom to choose their own directions for learning; encourages personal responsibility for those choices; and increases interpersonal interaction between students and learning facilitators (O'Banion, 1971).

A supporting tenet of the student development approach states that the entire college experience should be a learning situation whether or not academic credit is offered for particular activities (Crookston, 1972). The formal curriculum can move students only part way toward the goal of expanded awareness. Keeping this fact in mind, junior colleges should develop and financially underwrite an attractive co-curricular student development program that will provide valuable experiences for even the most practical-minded, working, commuter students (Collins, 1972). As Raines (1965) has reitterated, "What does it profit an individual if the school is near enough to make attendance feasible and open enough to permit him to enter if, once in, he is not helped in those many non-instructional areas where help is necessary to promote his development [p. 8]?"

The traditional student personnel point of view did much to focus attention on fulfilling the non-instructional needs of students. However, some components of that philosophy are incompatible with the basic precepts of the newer student development point of view. Table 2 contains a set of descriptive adjectives that Crookston (1972) has selected to illuminate the differences between these two philosophical orientations.

TABLE 2

Contrasting Behavioral Orientations Descriptive of Student Personnel and Student Development Models

Student Personnel	Student Development
Authoritarian	Egalitarian
Reactive	Proactive
Passive	Encountering
Remedial	Developmental
Corrective	Preventative
Controlling	Confronting
Cooperative	Collaborative
Status oriented	Competency oriented

In summary, the emergence of the student personnel point of view fostered a new concern for treating students as whole persons, not just as intellectual beings. This approach slowly evolved into the student development point of view which, in addition, is seeking to encourage the creation of a more facilitative atmosphere for student growth. When such an environment is established in the community colleges, student development advocates predict that a number of increases in student skills should be readily discernable--i.e., increased intellectual understanding, increased personal flexibility and creativity,

inhanced awareness of self and others, more socially responsible behavior, new courage to explore and experiment, a greater openness to new experiences, increased ability to learn, inhanced ability to respond positively to change, the molding of a useful value system, and the development of a satisfying lifestyle (O'Banion, 1971).

Creamer (1972) has asserted that this emphasis on the increased humanization of educational programs is essential because

> The educational process, as we know, is a socializing process, and frankly, it is my opinion that the value placed on various activities undertaken by schools generally have (sic) very little to do with being aimed toward the positive development of each individual student utilizing his optimum potential [p. 29].

However, he cautions that in addition to being a substantially justifible end in itself, humanness in education should spawn some identifiable improvements in the nature and value of educational programs.

Medsker (1972) has commented that the task of deepening and humanizing the educational process is especially difficult in the community colleges because these campuses are experiencing a steadily growing influx of increasingly diverse, disoriented, and dulled students nurtured by a confused society which is ambivalent about violence and unsure about values and directions. However, Emmet (1971) has argued that the task may not be as difficult as first imagined because "Human development is something that the public, students, the local community, alumni, legislative policymakers, and even faculty can accept [p. 49]."

* * * *

The arguments for new student development programs and more humanized education are very pervasive. The theories do not seem to difficult too

implement; and the means for doing so seem to be available. However, the literature contains few examples of community colleges which, through their actions, have committed themselves to making such changes. Those colleges whose student personnel divisions have moved in such directions have done so through the use of decentralized service schemes and the employment of student affairs staff members as instructors of a variety of human development courses.

In a follow-up to the 1965 AAJC Carnegie financed study, Jane Matson (1972) attempted to ascertain the degree to which decentralized services had been implemented in the community colleges. Remembering that the student development model has been present on the community college scene for almost two decades, Matson's findings are discouraging to say the least. For example, Matson found that only 37 percent of the institutions sampled had decentralized any of their student personnel services. In these colleges, the counseling services were those which usually had been affected by the new modifications. Matson also noted that no other student services were yet decentralized to any significant extent.

Matson's (1972) report revealed that in over two thirds of the colleges which had undergone decentralization, the goal was obtained primarily through the physical relocation of services rather than through any shift in administrative responsibility. However, she did find that three fifths of the institutions surveyed were offering some student personnel services to non-student members of the communities in which the junior colleges were located. Usually these outreach programs were composed of counseling and testing services.

Finally, Matson (1972) reported that 18 percent of the sampled institutions not decentralized at the time of the study stated that plans were underway to

move in that direction. However, a shocking 20 percent of the sample reported no intentions of extending any of their student personnel services to the community.

There does seem to be some significance in the fact that counseling services have been the first of the student personnel functions to be decentralized to any degree. Collins (1967) has argued convincingly that because the counseling service often becomes a vital nerve center in the community college, its physical location might act as a nonverbal advertisement--i.e.,

> The nature of student personnel facilities and their geographic pattern will carry an implicit, perhaps unconscious, yet, loud message to students, to the faculty and to student personnel workers themselves. If student personnel is housed in the Administrative Center the message is student personnel is part of the administration. If the counselors are isolated in a warren of cubicles to which admission is controlled, the message is "that is where you go to get your psyche fixed [p. 10]."

In his statements regarding the need for decentralized counseling services, Bingham (1972) was highly critical of the traditional patterns, saying that in their preference to remain office bound, counselors rendered themselves inaccessible to too many people. He condemned counselors for generally preferring to wait for self referals and "typical" cases rather than venturing into the campus community to search out other types of students needing a variety of counseling services. Ivey and Aschuler (1973) concurred, stating that counselors have made it doubly difficult on themselves by waiting passively for symptom-clients to bring in problems instead of assuming an active role in directly promoting programs to increase the psychological health of the community. Ivey and Aschuler (1972) insisted that

> The sheer magnitude of psychosocial problems demands that we revolutionize traditional forms of helping in ways that will increase our effectiveness. Current methods cannot succeed because they aim at remediation of the few in crises instead of promoting psychological growth for all and because traditional practices do nothing to cure the pathogenic institutions that cause "mental illness" and create major obstacles to normal development [p. 591].

The decentralization of student personnel services can be accomplished through the formation of counselor-teaching faculty teams which are then located in divisional centers scattered throughout a campus (Collins, 1972). William Rainey Harper College (Illinois), Forest Park Community College (St. Louis), and Portland Community College (Oregon) have successfully implemented this type of system. For example, at William Rainey Harper College, counselors in divisional centers focus their efforts on vocational guidance. Counselors are rotated to and from the centers on a regular basis in order to provide some centralized services in the college center. The rotation system also helps the divisional counselors maintain their professional identities with their other counseling and student services colleagues (O'Banion, 1971).

Fulton-Montgomery Community College (New York) also has organized the student personnel program along academic divisional lines. And, besides acting as divisional counselors, the student personnel staff members are encouraged to teach some classes and to sit on the faculty committees responsible for making curriculum decisions (O'Banion, 1971).

Prince George's Community College has used a different method to move student personnel programming closer to the clientele it is in existence to most directly serve. The administrators at this school hired a student provost who works at his position on a part-time basis while simultaneously carrying a full-time academic course load. The provost serves an ombudsman-type function in which he listens to student complaints; participates in planning the summer

orientation program; maintains contact with the student government; regularly conducts polls to solicit student opinion on controversial issues; writes a column for the student newspaper; and attends the president's and student affairs staff meetings (Smith, 1973).

Community counseling centers have developed as another form of outreach programming or decentralized student services. These centers are established in store front settings within the geographic areas being served by a community college. They usually are staffed and financed by the college. The centers are intended to be easily accessible, non-threatening places where individuals may seek and quickly receive a myriad of counseling, testing, and college admissions services. Practical and fiscal considerations have forced many community colleges operating such centers to restrict even these few services.

A working example of a community counseling center may be observed at William Rainey Harper College. Their center was established in 1970 following numerous requests from the community (Fischer and Rankin, 1973). Originally, the work at the center was confined to educational and vocational testing and making counseling referals. However, after the center was operational, the staff discovered the existence of a tremendous need for a comprehensive family service and referal agency. The center's operations therefore were revised. The primary focus was shifted from academic and vocational counseling in order to also incorporate personal, marriage, family, and group counseling into the program. The success of the center has been much greater than anticipated. Not only has it provided a much needed service to the community; but also has given Harper College wider exposure in the community (Fischer and Rankin, 1973).

Penn Valley Community College (Kansas City, Mo.) has decentralized its student personnel services through another interesting means. Their campus career center operates a mobile career counseling van staffed by counselors and their assistants. Bilingual counselors are available for clients who do not speak English. Each week the van parks at eight different locations within the business and residental areas surrounding the college. The long term effects of the project still must be determined; but to date, both the college and community reportedly are pleased with the present response to the mobile counseling unit (deZutter, 1973).

The establishment of courses for the development of human potential has become one of the more popular means through which student development theory has been implemented. Through the use of such psychological and human development education, counselors and other student personnel staff members have taken the initiative in deliberately teaching aspects of mental health to groups of students with proactive education rather than reactive remediation being a primary goal (Ivey and Aschuler, 1973). In essence, what the student personnel staff are beginning to teach in the classrooms is closely related to what they have been attempting to impart in their offices to individuals and/or small groups of students (Creamer, 1972). Thus, these new organized classes are helping to expand counseling from a purely therapeutic experience for a selected clientele to a much broader educational process encompassing all interested members of the academic and local communities (O'Banion, 1971). Besides enabling the student services staffs to reach greater numbers of students, courses of this nature hold the potential to strengthen the position of student personnel services in the community college while simultaneously improving the

college's total impact on all its participants (Creamer, 1972). Specifically,

> If student personnel work is to become more firmly lodged in the fiber of the institution, then one method would be to organize and offer a piece of the curriculum appropriate to the philosophy and practice of student personnel work. Such organization helps make student personnel work visible to the faculty and administration. Budget cuts are less likely to be made in courses.... Self preservation is not the only motivation for a curriculum in human development however. Students need to have their needs met more clearly, and courses in human development help students select experiences commensurate with their needs [O'Banion, 1972].

Prior to 1972, no national or state wide investigation of the status and scope of student personnel services instructional programs had been made. Therefore, Don Creamer (1972) undertook the task, mailing survey instruments to 920 community colleges. Usable responses were received from 322 institutions, 100 of which stated they had some type of human development instructional program in operation. Interestingly, Creamer (1972) discovered that no significant relationship seemed to exist between a community college offering such a program and the size of the student personnel staff, size of the student enrollment, type of financial support, and the type of campus. However, the existence of such programs seemed to directly reflect the college staff's concern for developing the human potential of their students. Creamer (1972) also found that in the community colleges offering such instruction,

(a) the largest percentage of institutions offered rarely more than one or two human development courses.

(b) the number of course sections offered ranged from one to 50 with one community college reporting that it offered 150 sections of a particular human development course.

(c) the largest number of responding colleges had been offering human development courses for two semesters. Ninety-two percent of the

schools had been offering the courses every semester since their implementation. One community college indicated it had been offering human development courses for 25 years.

(d) the largest number of colleges limited the size of their human development classes to 8-12 students.

(e) the human development faculty are most commonly selected from student staffs, counseling staffs or from the psychology faculty.

(f) the aims of human development instruction include fostering the development of good relationships with workers and supervisors; improvement of interpersonal relationships; examination of values, attitudes, interests, and beliefs; actualization of personal potential; library untilization; dealing with personal, academic, and vocational concerns, improvement of reading, writing, and vocational skills; and career planning.

(g) the largest concentration of responding community colleges enrolled 1-25 percent of the total student population in the human development classes.

(h) course credit for these classes was offered toward the AA degree, transfer programs, technical/occupational degrees, and for elective purposes.

(i) fifty-three percent of the schools said their human development programs had been used in part for professional staff development.

(j) however, 43 percent of the schools reported problems in financing their human development programs.

O'Banion's (1971) suggestion that student personnel staff members teach student development courses not usually available in the instructional programs has been implemented in a number of community colleges. Fulton-Montgomery College, as example, offers a series of human development seminars which enroll 1,000 day students and 250 evening students. The titles of the classes are generally reflective of course content: Seminar on College Life; Seminar on Personal Development; Seminar on Educational and Vocational Exploration; Achievement and Motivation Seminar; Seminar on the Art of Loving; Seminar on Human Relations and Group Dynamics; faculty workshops and seminars; and seminars on innovative teaching. The latter two types of classes are in-service programs intended to improve teacher performance and strengthen the relationships between the teaching faculty and student affairs staffs (Creamer, 1972).

Napa Valley Community College (California) offers two human development courses. The class titled Psychological Testing is an activity class in which students are administered interest inventories and ability tests in an effort to encourage guided self-evaluation and inhanced self-awareness. The course also is intended to provide a means through which testing can be placed in a proper perspective for the students (Dallas, 1971). The second human development course taught at the college is titled Environmental/Group Processes. Students taking the class are assigned to small groups that are guided by facilitators who encourage the exploration of difficulties in any area of living that are relevant to the group. The college offers freshmen credit for both these classes (Dallas, 1971).

A somewhat different example of human development course implementation may be observed at El Centro College (Texas). In this institution, the student

services staff has become involved in running two-day student-faculty communications labs. The labs are intensive live-in sessions designed to enlarge understanding of the nature of communication between intergenerational groups. These sessions also have afforded an excellent opportunity for conducting leadership training programs (O'Banion, 1971).

Summarizing his reactions to the establishment of human development programs in the community colleges, Creamer (1972) has cautioned that

> The human development counselor/teacher should be an orchestrator of the growth process, interacting with the learning situations of students in a way that positively enhances both curriculum content and manner of instruction carried out in the name of vocational and technical education. While it is my obvious belief that human development should be the central theme for all curriculum experiences, and that the basic thrusts for all school activities should be aimed toward increasing mental health and optimizing the degree of total maturity demonstrated by the student, I feel that pragmatism and realistic thinking impose at least a delay in moving toward this model of behavior and this direction as a standard for the community junior college staff [p. 34].

Student activities programs probably have been the most traditional avenue for the expansion of human potential outside the college classroom. However, the often discussed lack of a sense of community on the junior college campuses has seemed to neutralize many efforts directed toward the revitalization of student activities programs. The large population of commuter students on these campuses very often remains closely tied to their precollege social lives, high school experiences, and other organizations and outside activities (George and George, 1971). As a result, participation in community college student activities programs is unbelievably low. The lack of a strong activities program is deplorable considering that "Involvement outside the classroom, whether it be in campus government, in a social club, or with a local action group, can be of great benefit to the community college student [Staff, 1973]."

If the student activities programs are going to be revitalized, community college staffs must quit regarding these experiences as incidental or frivolous wastes of time. Instead, student activities must be carefully encouraged and permitted to permeate every building and every corner of the campus. Their existence must be felt wherever students congregate (Wiegman, 1969). Before staff members can assist in the encouragement of student involvement in the extracurriculum, they first must cease devoting so much of their energy to making excuses for student apathy toward the programs--e.g., "The constraints of commuting, part-time employment, and short term enrollment make a viable student activities program an unrealistic dream [Starr, 1973]." Instead, the staff must regard such realities as problems to be solved, rather than as handy excuses for inaction.

To help student activities programs function effectively, administrators, faculty, and general staff also must maintain a deep-seeded conviction to move beyond only making token attempts to involve students in the extracurriculum. Communications channels with student government must be kept open so that constructive criticisms and suggestions can be exchanged. Adequate physical facilities and scheduled activities time blocks must be provided. More community colleges also might seriously consider making some type of financial assistance available to clubs, organizations, and other activities groups on campus (McDaniel). And regrettably, some community colleges simply will have to acknowledge that one of the greatest barriers to the proliferation of strong activities programs is the continued, often unquestioned reliance, placed on supposedly representative student governments "which are neither representative or governments and which have been completely disavowed by most of the student body who do not even bother to vote in elections [Richardson, 1972, p. 56]."

* * * *

Unless they are effectively administered, the evolving student development programs could disintegrate into ineffectual attempts to carry the philosophy of the open door community college experience into practice. Although many suggestions have been forwarded regarding the means by which such programs might be established and operated, the management by objectives system, with its emphasis on continued accountability, seems to offer the most promising method of insuring enlightened administration. Management by objectives programs already have enabled many student services administrators to implement a variety of new program goals--an important accomplishment in an era in which student affairs personnel have been severely criticized and labeled as bureaucratic maintenance men (O'Banion, 1972).

Advocates of student services accountability systems have continued to stress that effectiveness, rather than efficiency, is their major goal. Effective administration of student personnel programs can be facilitated by (a) making an accurate analysis of the jobs to be done; (b) noting the optimal times for accomplishing these tasks; and (c) defining the roles and relationships of the personnel employed to do these jobs (McDaniel and Lombardi, 1972).

Item "c" deserves special attention because the success of the entire management by objectives operation hinges upon the cooperation of the members of the organization. Management theorists have found that people will work more effectively if they know what is expected of them and receive feedback on how well they are meeting these expectations; clearly understand the ways in which their activities are being evaluated; and are actively involved in the process of establishing organizational goals (Boylan, 1973). The interpersonal rela-

tionships of the organization also may be inhanced through the

(a) Group definition and acceptance of goals

(b) Readiness to change forms as goals change

(c) Leader remaining a part of the group

(d) Existence of reasonable calendars and schedules

(e) Mutual respect of professional competence

(f) Open communication of fact and feeling

(g) Machinery for complaint resolution (McDaniel and Lombardi, 1972).

Effective management/accountability programs must be grounded in a system in which the daily operations of each office in the organization are based on the goals desired by the whole organization (Boylan, 1973). However, caution must be exercised in this regard because

> Many student personnel administrators may tend to confuse accountability statements with job descriptions. A job description is useless at this point in the system because it usually describes the process of how a job is to be done. Consequently, the job description is not measureable and will not lend itself to the next step in the system, that of establishing specific performance measurements [Boylan, 1973].

Thus, whether quantative or subjective measures are used, the purpose of accountability measurement is to clarify the relationship between accountabilities and goals (Boylan, 1973).

A continuing evaluation program is the key to the successful implementation of any management/accountability system. Student personnel administrators must meet with their staffs at regular intervals in order to discuss the organization's progress toward meeting the accountability objectives and to provide necessary counseling and support (Boylan, 1973). To be most effective, these evaluation sessions must occur on a consistent, regularly scheduled basis,

preferably once a week. Also, both practical and ethical considerations require that individual privacy should be respected in the evaluative process. As Fisher and Howell (1972) have noted, "Methods of evaluation can be designed in such a way as to avoid exposing feelings about oneself, while reinforcing and clarifying the process of self assessment [p. 121]."

In addition to the evaluative sessions, some provision also should be made to conduct more extensive, on-going in-service programs for student personnel staffs (McConnell, 1965). Through this means, the professional staff will receive the added departmental impetus to keep themselves abreast of new developments in their fields. In-service training sessions also can serve a valuable purpose in increasing interdepartmental communications.

The establishment of internal management and accountability systems is essential if student personnel services are going to reorganize and become a more positive force in the community colleges. Likewise, more favorable campus opinion of student services should exist if the new programs also are developed in accordance with basic institutional philosophies and objectives (Medsker, 1972). Only through these means will student services programs be able to permeate the life of the entire campus. Some individuals might ask if this is even a desirable or realistic goal. The answer is an emphatic "yes" because, in the broadest sense, student personnel work is a vital component of every student oriented job being performed on the community college campus.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Beals, Lester, dir. Final Report of An Institute for Community College Faculty, Student Personnel Specialists, Administrators and Students. July 31, 1971. ERIC: ED 069 608.

Bingham, Ronald D. The Application of Promising Counseling Approaches in Various Educational Settings. Paper presented at the APGA convention, Chicago, Ill., March 25-30, 1972. ERIC: ED 067 562.

Blocker, Clyde E. and James A. Odom. "Influences from the Outside." Student Development Programs in the Community Junior College. Edited by Terry O'Banion and Alice Thurston. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972.

Boylan, H.R. "Approaching Accountability: Some Steps along the Way," NASPA Journal, 10 (April, 1973), 322-27.

Collins, Charles C. Junior College Student Personnel Programs; What They Are and What They Should Be. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1967. ERIC: ED 017 228.

Collins, Charles C. "Student Characteristics and Their Implications for Student Personnel Work." Student Development Programs in the Community Junior College. Edited by Terry O'Banion and Alice Thurston. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972.

Creamer, Don G. and others. Human Development Instruction for Career Students in the Community College: An Exploratory Study. Los Angeles, Calif.: League for Innovation in the Community College. September, 1972. ERIC: ED 069 270.

Crookston, Burns B. "An Organizational Model for Student Development," NASPA Journal, 10 (July, 1972), 3-13. ERIC: EJ 060 006.

Dallas, Gladys E. Attrition Prevention Through Counseling Among Community College Students. NORCAL, Phase III. 1971. ERIC: ED 075 012.

Directors' Evaluation Report. In-Service Training for Administrators, Faculty, and Students of a Developing Community College. Iowa Lake Community College. 1971. ERIC: ED 070 761.

Emmet, Thomas A. "Student Personnel Services: Who Needs Them?" College and University Business, 51 (November, 1971), 47-49.

Fischer, Guerin A. and Gary Rankin. "A Community Counseling Center for Total Community Service," Community and Junior College Journal, 43 (February, 1973). 48+. ERIC: EJ 070 558.

Fisher, Margaret B. and Joe A. Howell. "Evaluation and Accountability," NASPA Journal, 10 (October, 1972), 118-23. ERIC: EJ 074 566.

Fordyce, Joseph F. "Evaluation of Student Services in Community Colleges." Student Development Programs in the Community Junior College. Edited by Terry O'Banion and Alice Thurston. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972.

Gardner, Glen Martin, Robert R. Price, and William W. Stevenson. The Association between Local School Administrators' and Counselors' Attitudes Toward Vocational Education and Students' Participation in an Area Vocational-Technical School. Oklahoma State Department of Vocational and Technical Education: Stillwater Devision on Research, Planning and Evaluation. ERIC: ED 069 913.

George, Rickey L. and Karol A. George. "Meeting the Non-Academic Needs Unique to the Junior College Student," NASPA Journal, 9 (October, 1971), 155-59.

Girdner, Jerry H. Counselor-Counselee Ratios in California Junior Colleges, 1972-1973. April 19, 1973. ERIC: ED 975 009.

Ivey, Allen E. and Alfred S. Aschuler, eds. "Psychological Education: A Prime Function of the Counselor," Personnel and Guidance Journal, 51 (May, 1973), 586-974.

Matson, Jane E. "Appraisal of Existing and Potential Resources for the Preparation of Junior College Student Personnel Specialists." Junior College Student Personnel Programs; Appraisal and Development. T.R. McConnell, chairman. National Commission for Appraisal and Development of Junior College Student Personnel Programs, November, 1965.

Matson, Jane E. "A Perspective on Student Personnel Services," Junior College Journal, 42 (March, 1972), 48-52.

McConnell, T.R., chair. Junior College Student Personnel Programs; Appraisal and Development. A report to the Carnegie Corporation, New York, from the National Committee for Appraisal and Development of Junior College Student Personnel Programs. November, 1965.

McDaniel, J.W. Essential Student Personnel Practices in Junior Colleges. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges.

Medsker, Leland L. "The Cultural Role of Student Personnel Services in the Junior College." Student Development Programs in the Community Junior College. Edited by Terry O'Banion and Alice Thurston. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972.

O'Banion, Terry. New Directions in Community Junior College Student Personnel Programs. American College Personnel Association, 1971.

O'Banion, Terry. "Organizing and Administering Student Development Programs in the Community Junior College," Peabody Journal of Education, 49 (July, 1972), 268-78. ERIC: EJ 060 983.

O'Banion, Terry and Alice Thurston. Student Development Programs in the Community Junior College. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972.

Raines, Max R. "Report Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations." Junior College Student Personnel Programs; Appraisal and Development. T.R. McConnell, chairman. National Commission for Appraisal and Development of Junior College Student Personnel Programs, November, 1965.

Richardson, Richard C. "The Student's Role in the Affairs of the College." Student Development Programs in the Community Junior College. Edited by Terry O'Banion and Alice Thurston. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972.

Smith, Marc. "Meet Marc Smith, Student Provost," Community and Junior College Journal, 43 (February, 1973), 16-17. ERIC: EJ 070 532.

Starr, Jerry. "Student Involvement; Should We Bother?" Community and Junior College Journal, 43 (February, 1973), 8-9. ERIC: EJ 070 528.

Wiegman, Robert R. General Education in Occupational Education Programs Offered by Junior Colleges. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969. ERIC: ED 031 233.

deZutter, Patricia. "Career Center: New Start to College or Job," American Education, 9 (March, 1973), 19-23. ERIC: EJ 078 513.